

REMARKS

Claims 1-11, 16-19, 22, 25 and 26 are pending in this application, with Claims 1, 16, 18, 22, 25 and 26 being independent claims.

Claims 14-15, 20-21, 23-24 and 27 have been cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter presented therein.

Claims 1, 16, 18, 22, 25 and 26 have been amended. Applicant submits that support for these amendments can be found in the original disclosure, and therefore no new matter has been added.

Claim 1-3, 6-7, 10-12, 14, 20-23 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,748,533 B1 (Wu et al.). Claims 18 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,707,774 (Kuroda, et al.). Claims 16-17 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Publication No. 2004/0059918 A1 (Xu et al.). Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu et al. in view of Kuroda et al. Claims 4 and 5 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu et al. in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0034781 A1 (Natarajan). Claim 19 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuroda et al. and Xu et al. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu et al. in view of Xu et al. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for the reasons discussed below.

As recited in independent Claim 1, the present invention includes, *inter alia*, the features of segmenting objective content into a plurality of partial contents, encrypting at least one partial content, embedding a digital watermark to the encrypted partial content,

decrypting the partial content in which the digital watermark is embedded, and combining the decrypted partial content and other partial content obtained by the segmenting. With these features, data is obtained in which a partial content that has been encrypted and had a digital watermark embedded in it is combined with other partial content which has not been encrypted or had a digital watermark embedded in it. Since only a partial content is encrypted, embedded with a digital watermark, and decrypted, deterioration of the quality of the objective content is prevented. In other words, since the processing that adversely affects the quality (encrypting, embedding with a watermark, and decrypting) is only applied to at least one partial content and not to the other partial contents, the impact on the overall quality of the objective content is diminished.

Applicant submits that the cited art fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-mentioned features. Wu et al fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-mentioned features of Claim 1. Although Wu et al. discloses watermarking an encrypted portion, it fails to disclose or suggest segmenting objective content into a plurality of partial contents, encrypting at least one partial content, embedding a digital watermark to the encrypted partial content, decrypting the encrypted partial content in which a digital watermark is embedded, and combining the decrypted partial content with other partial content segmented from the objective content.

More specifically, as shown in Fig. 1 of Wu et al., a target article is divided into three portions, a feature is extracted from each portion, and the extracted feature is encrypted. A watermark is generated from the encrypted feature, and the watermark is rendered onto the other portion. See step 308 in Fig. 3. However, in Wu et al. the watermark is rendered onto another portion that is not encrypted, rather than embedded in

an encrypted partial content as recited in Claim 1. Further, in Wu et al. the watermark is generated using an encrypted portion of a target article into which the watermark is rendered, in contrast to embedding a digital watermark that is not generated based on a portion of a target object.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Wu et al. fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-mentioned features of the present invention recited in independent Claim 1. Applicant submits that the other art of record also fails to disclose or suggest at least those features and therefore is patentable over the art of record, whether that art is considered individually or taken in combination.

Independent Claim 22 recites similar features and is believed patentable for reasons similar to Claim 1.

As recited in independent Claim 16, the present invention includes, among others, the features of discriminating whether an output style of content is outputting to a display or to a printer, and embedding a digital watermark in the content by a scheme corresponding to a discrimination result. Applicant submits that Xu does not disclose or suggest at least these features. Instead, Xu discloses an element for inserting an owner ID and a user ID as a watermark to an audio signal. That reference does not disclose or suggest discriminating whether an output style is outputting to a display or to a printer, and it does not embed a digital watermark by a scheme corresponding to a discrimination result. The other cited art also fails to disclose or suggest at least these features.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the present invention recited in independent Claim 16 is patentable over the art of record, whether that art is considered individually or

taken in combination. Independent Claim 25 recites similar features and is believed patentable for reasons similar to Claim 16.

As recited in independent Claim 18, the present invention includes, *inter alia*, the features of discriminating a type of apparatus that outputs content and embedding a digital watermark in the content by a scheme corresponding to a discrimination result. Applicant submits that Kuroda fails to disclose or suggest at least these features, and that the other cited art also fails to disclose or suggest at least those features. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the present invention recited in independent Claim 18 is patentable over the art of record, whether that art is considered individually or taken in combination. Independent Claim 26 recites similar features and is believed patentable for reasons similar to Claim 18.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the claims are believed to be in allowable form. Therefore, early passage to issue is respectfully solicited.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'B. L. Klock', is written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicant

Brian L. Klock

Registration No. 36,570

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
BLK/mls